

REMARKS

The Examiner rejected claims 1, 2, 4, 5, 8, 9, 14, 15, 17, 18, 21, 24-30, 34, 35, 40, 41, 43, and 44 as being anticipated by Haneda, et al., US Pat. No. 6,204,932.

With respect to claims 1 and 25-29, Examiner suggests that Haneda discloses a method of processing an image that includes sensing an image from an original document, modifying the image by a first process to compensate for non-uniformity of sensing the image, modifying the image by a second process based upon the image itself, creating the print ready data stream as a result of the modifications, providing a print ready data stream of the image to a third process which modifies print ready data stream in a manner that includes mirroring, and providing the modified image to an output device.

Haneda suggests an image processing pipeline (See FIG. 4, item B) where the data is manipulated in a suitable manner for output. The print ready data stream is provided to the image forming portion C which includes an image correction processing function B92 that facilitates the modification of the image for front/reverse side in a manner suitable for two sided printing. The image correction process B92 is solely for the purpose of accommodating the two sided printing and is not for the purpose of traditional image processing, such as those functions performed by Section B of FIG. 4.

Claim 1 has been amended to patentably distinguish over the prior art by claiming a print ready data stream that is modified by at least one of horizontal cloning and vertical cloning.

Haneda fails to suggest modification of the print ready data stream in either of these two ways. Also there would be no motivation to modify Haneda to include either one of these functionalities since horizontal and vertical cloning are traditionally considered processing functions and thus would naturally be done in the imaging processing portion B (see FIG. 4).

Appl. No.: 09/710,026
Amdt. dated: December 23, 2003
Reply dated: June 29, 2004

7146.0098

Claims 2-13 depend from claim 1, either directly or indirectly, and are patentable for the same reasons asserted for claim 1.

Claim 14 patentably distinguishes over Haneda by claiming the first mode comprising horizontally cloning while being free of vertical cloning stored within a buffer, and processing the image as a result of the second mode by the first mode.

Haneda fails to disclose such a processing technique.

Claims 15-20 depend from claim 14, either directly or indirectly, and are patentable for the same reasons as asserted for claim 14.

Claim 21 patentably distinguishes over Haneda by claiming the restoring of the modified image in a compressed form in the buffer, where the modified image requires sufficiently less memory for storing than the size of the buffer.

Haneda fails to disclose a comparison between the modified image and the size of the buffer.

Claims 22-24 depend from claim 21 and are patentable for the same reason asserted for claim 21.

Claim 25 is patentably distinguishes by claiming that the print ready data stream includes at least one of horizontally cloning and vertical cloning.

Haneda simply fails to disclose the modification of the stream in the manner claimed.

Claims 26-39 depend from claim 25, either directly or indirectly, and are patentable for the same reasons asserted by claim 25.

Appl. No.: 09/710,026
Amdt. dated: December 23, 2003
Reply dated: June 29, 2004

7146.0098

Claim 40 patentably distinguishes over Haneda by selecting the first mode that includes horizontally cloning free from vertical cloning of the image, storing the image within a buffer, and processing the image stored in the buffer using the second mode by first mode.

Haneda fails to disclose the claimed combination.

Claims 41-46 depend from claim 40, either directly or indirectly, and are patentable for the same reason asserted for claim 40.

The Examiner is requested to reconsider claim 1-46 and to pass the application to issue.

If the Examiner believes that for any reason direct contact with applicant's attorney would advance the prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at the number below.

Respectfully submitted,
Chernoff Vilhauer McClung & Stenzel, LLP
1600 ODS Tower
601 SW Second Avenue
Portland, Oregon 97204

By: 

Kevin L. Russell
Reg. No. 38,292
Telephone No. (503) 227-5631
FAX No. (503) 228-4373

Appl. No.: 09/710,026

7146.0098

Amdt. dated: December 23, 2003

Reply dated: June 29, 2004